

ARGUMENTS AND REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's final Action dated September 17, 2009. In light of the amendments and arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 13, 16, 19 and 20 have been objected to. Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lachowyn in view of Braun.

Claims 1, 12 and 17-19 have been amended. Claims 2-11, 14-17 and 20-35 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Claims 1, 12, 13 and 17-19 are pending.

Objection to the Claims

The Examiner has objected to Claims 13, 16 and 19 as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "said conveyor drive means." Claims 13 and 19 have been amended to now require simply a "drive means," which is introduced in Claim 1. Claim 16 has been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection thereto moot.

Claims 16 and 20 have been objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "said processing stations". Claims 16 and 20 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejections thereto moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of a combination of Lachowyn and Braun. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as the cited combination fails to disclose a clock pulse for synchronizing the processing stations. Conversely, Lachowyn discloses a two-way relationship with multiple signal wherein the sensor (64) senses, for example, an index reference on the article (20) or mandrel (16) at the position (24) wherein the sensed signal is provided to the controller (26)." During the first step the sensors collect signals that are subsequently sent to the controller. Only after such collecting step does the controller generate multiple signals to be sent to each of the servo motors. That is, the controller provides control signals to each servo motor 52 to maintain registration for a blanket

(46) at each print position with the article 20 being printed. Contrary to aforesaid description of Lachowyn, an apparatus according to independent Claim 1 of the instant application has the advantage of being clearly more simple and, therefore, less prone to errors.

In addition, a further difference between embodiments of the present invention and Lachowyn is the direct relationship to the processing stations contemplated. The transmission of the clock pulse is used directly for processing at the processing stations. In other words one of skill in the art will appreciate that a direct control is carried out. Conversely, Lachowyn discloses indirect control. More specifically, Lachowyn, as well as the Examiner, states that multiple signals are used that have to be sent to the processing stations to be interpreted thereby to a start and stop as well as dictate the duration of the processing at each processing station. Beside the fact that such multiplicity of signals and the higher complexity of such signals increases the error rate of such a system, the interpretation of received signals at the processing stations takes additional effort that usually results in an extended processing time.

Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly expresses that the starting signals do not provide for an indirect control as in Lachowyn. Claims 12, 13 and 17-19 are also believed allowable due to their dependence on allowable Claim 1.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. Applicants also respectfully traverse the remainder of the Examiner's assertions as to what is disclosed in and/or taught by the cited prior art. That is, since the arguments made herein are believed to sufficiently address the rejections, any assertions by the Examiner that are not specifically addressed are not admitted as true. Furthermore, any arguments concerning motivation to combine, rationale to combine, etc. and not specifically provided in this response are not waived.

In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,
SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: /C.W. Mueller/
Craig W. Mueller
Reg. No. 52,055
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado 80202
303-863-9700

Date: March 16, 2010